ARMOUR et al.
Appl. No. 09/674,857
June 13, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

The claims have been revised to define the invention with additional clarity. Support for the revisions can be found throughout the application (as regards claim 55, see, for example, page 10). New dependent claims 68-70 have been added in view of the revision of the claims from which they depend. No new matter has been added.

The specification stands objected to for allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis of "neutrophil antigen", "coronary artery occlusion", and "HDN". Basis for the objection is not understood and the Examiner is requested to clarify the concern so that Applicants will be in a position to respond. It is pointed out, however, that the terms to which the Examiner refers are found, for example, in claims of the PCT application (of which this is the U.S. national phase) as filed, including in claim 18 (neutrophil antigen), claim 31 (coronary artery occlusion) and at page 50, line 6 (haemolytic disease of the newborn – HDN).

Claims 40 and 49 stand objected to. The objection is moot in view of the above-noted revision of the claims.

Claim 55 stands objected to as being duplicative of claim 21. The objection is moot in view of the above-noted revision of claim 55.

Claims 21, 22, 55, 56, 66 and 67 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order in view of the above-noted claim revisions which insert steps corresponding to those indicated by the Examiner as being required. Reconsideration is requested.

- 18 -

ARMOUR et al.
Appl. No. 09/674,857
June 13, 2006

Claims 16-20, 23-29, 38, 39, 47, 48, 50-54 and 57-65 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order in view of the above-noted claim revisions and comments that follow.

Claims 16, 17, 50 and 51 have been revised to read "the" nucleotide sequence, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 27, 38 and 47 have been revised to include the full terminology for HPA.

Claims 27, 38 and 47 have been amended to include the full terminology for GBM and to make reference to type IV collagen.

Claims 28 and 62 have been amended to include the full terminology for HDN (support being found at page 50, line 6).

Claims 27, 38 and 47 have been revised to include proper Markush language. Reference to a human platelet antigen (HPA) has been retained and specific reference to HPA-1a is found in new claims 67-69.

Claims 39 and 48 have been revised to address the Examiner's concerns as regards the reference to "anti-CD52 antigen ...".

Basis for the Examiner's concern as regards the definiteness of claims 23 and 57 is, respectfully, not understood. Claims 23 and 57 relate to a simple method of binding a target by contacting it with an antibody. The reference to "which target molecule ... by said binding molecule" was added to address a concern raised by the Examiner in the Office Action dated April 25, 2005 (see page 6, lines 1-6). The Examiner is respectfully requested to clarify the basis for the rejection so that Applicants will be positioned to respond.

Claims 28 and 62 have been revised in a manner which is believed to address the Examiner's concerns.

- 19 -

ARMOUR et al.
Appl. No. 09/674,857
June 13, 2006

In view of the above, reconsideration is requested.

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect

is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: Mary J. Wilson

Mary J. Wilson
Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

- 20 -